pply of copies of Parent Acts in respect of Amending Bills.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Certain Hon'ble mbers expressed difficulty in follow- the provisions of Amending Bills the absence of the parent Acts. eaking on this subject on the 19th tober 1954, Sri Bheemappa Naik ggested that the parent Act may be pplied to all Members or the original ovisions of the enactments might be inted with the amendment so that e Members could have a sort of dy reference. Sri Mulka Govinda ddy suggested that copies of parent ts should also be available at the veral Guest Houses. Sri S. Srinivasa engar wanted that the Library tached to the Legislative Secretariat ould be improved. I observed that would look into the matter and try make satisfactory arrange- ents.

So far as Amending Bills are ncerned, Hon'ble Members will alise that it would not be possible in l cases to supply copies of parent cts to all the Members. The Amend- ent may be to a few clauses of a ry big enactment; it may be that e Bill seeks to add clauses for the derstanding of which the parent ct is not necessary. Sometimes the me Act undergoes amendment by ason of several amending Bills ought up at different sessions. For ese reasons, it would be impracti- ble to arrange for the distribution parent Acts to Members in the case every Amending Bill. At the same me, there is considerable force in the servations made by Members about eir difficulties. I have therefore quested the Government and they ve also agreed to place in the ibrary of the Legislature Secretariat copies of all State Acts. The overnment have also agreed to set up library in each Guest House ntaining one or two sets of all the ate Laws. This should go a long ay to help Members in reading up e necessary provisions.

I have also requested the Government nd they have agreed to print as nnexures to Amending Bills such of the Sections of the Parent Acts which are necessary for a proper understanding of the Bill. I am sure that with these facilities, Members will experience no difficulty in understanding and following up legislation that comes up before the House.

In regard to the Legislature Secretariat Library, I may mention that action is being taken to add to the Library many good and useful books. The Library is now given a grant of about Rs. 3,000 to Rs. 4,000 a year. We are trying to spend this money on the purchase of as many useful books as possible. It takes some time to build up a good library. I would also reqnest Hon'ble Members, if they have any suggestions to offer regarding the purchase of particular books for the Library, kindly to forward such lists to the Secretary.

Matter to be treated as 'sub judice'.

Mr. SPEAKER.—On the 18th October 1954 when supplementary questions were being put in respect of question No. 452, the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition wanted a clarification from the Chair as to whether a matter which is under Police investigation could be treated as *sub judice*. I stated that I would examine the position and give a ruling later.

In the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Assembly, we do not find the expression '*sub judice*'. What is prohibited under Rule 26 (2) (p) is that a question should not ask for information "on a matter which is under adjudication by a court of law having jurisdiction in any part of India." But because '*sub judice*' carries the same meaning and is a compact expression, it is commonly used instead of the words I have quoted above. The expression '*sub judice*' according to Ballentine's Law Dictionary means "before the Court, for its consideration and determination". In the Law Lexicon by Sri Ramanath Iyer, "*sub judice*" has been stated to mean "before a Judge or court pending decision of a competent court".

(MR. SPEAKER.)

The purpose underlying the prohibition of such questions is clearly to prevent any questions being asked in relation to a matter which is before a Court and is therefore likely either directly or indirectly to prejudice a case under trial.

It therefore follows that unless a court has taken cognisance of a matter, it would not become '*sub judice*' and the prohibition in Rule 26 (2) (p) would not apply. The filing of a First Information Report or of other steps taken prior to the filing of a charge-sheet or prior to a court taking cognisance of a matter would not make a matter *sub judice*. Of course, each such point of order has to be decided on its merits and a ruling can be given only on the facts and circumstances of each case.

There are a number of rulings and the point is not therefore lacking in authority. But on this occasion and in view of the clear wording of our Rules of Procedure, it is unnecessary to refer to any of them.

Statement of objects and reasons with reference to an amended Bill.

MR. SPEAKER.—During the October Session of last year, when the Cattle Trespass Bill as passed by the Legislative Council was proposed to be discussed on the motion for consideration, some members objected on the ground that the Statement of Objects and Reasons accompanying the Bill bore no relation to the Bill. I gave a ruling on that occasion to the effect that the Bill was not being introduced in the Assembly for the first time and that therefore, strictly it was not necessary for a Statement of Objects and Reasons to accompany the Bill I stated that our practice was however to permit the Bill together with the Statement of Objects and Reasons as originally appended to the Bill in order to give the Members of the House an idea of the purposes underlying the Bill when it was first introduced in the other House. I also stated that I would get this question examined again.

I find that the practice in different legislatures differs. But in view of the objection taken, I have made arrangements, from this Session onwards, to see that where a Bill which is passed by the Legislative Council is thereafter taken up in this House, the copies of the Bill to be distributed among the Members will not carry any Statement of Objects and Reasons. Only the Bill as finally passed by the Legislative Council will be printed and supplied to the Members. However, in order that the Members may have some idea of the objects underlying the Bill when it was first introduced in the other House, I have, with the concurrence of the Chairman of the Legislative Council, arranged that copies of Bills introduced in one House will be made available to the Members of the other House also.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE.

Re : Central assistance to Shimsha Extension Scheme.

MR. SPEAKER.— The Minister for Agriculture wants to make a statement, He may do so now.

DR. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—(Minister for Agriculture).—With permission of the Hon'ble Speaker, I rise to make the following statement :—

It may be recalled that on the concluding day of the previous session of the House, I replied in the affirmative to a supplementary question under Question No. 322 put by Hon'ble member Sri M. V. Rama Rao as to whether Central assistance of Rs. 150 lakhs had been given to the State for executing the Shimsha Extension Scheme. I regret that a mistake occurred in furnishing this answer. As the question came up at a very late stage of the session there was no time for me to place the correct position before the House. I am therefore taking the earliest opportunity of doing so.

2. The Shimsha Extension Project is one of the schemes included in the Five-Year Plan and is estimated to cost about Rs. 345 lakhs. The question of executing the Project has been under correspondence with the Planning